

Name of Committee: Devotion School Building Committee

Meeting Date: 9 April 2014 Time: 8:00 a.m. Meeting Location: Health Center, Denny Room

Attendees: See attached sign-in sheets.

Next Meetings: May 2, 2014 at 8:00 a.m. in Town Hall Room 103 and May 30, 2014 in Town Hall Room 103.

Topic: Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes of the 21 March 2014 Devotion School Building Committee Meeting. Unanimously approved.

Topic: Update on Preliminary Design Program (PDP) Submission

T. Guigli stated that the PDP was submitted to the Massachusetts School Building Authority (MSBA) on 24 March 2014 and that the review period is expected to be up to six (6) weeks. To date only a few comments of a clerical nature have been received and addressed by the TOB. These minor items have not impacted the MSBA review. He further stated that the architect, Town staff and the Building Commission representative to the Building Committee have commenced an exercise to assess the impacts of construction on school operations, contractor operations and the neighborhood for each of the options under consideration. This is very preliminary owing to the conceptual nature of the designs at this time. It will be an iterative process that will need to be continually revisited as the designs are developed. He reported that the Board of Selectmen voted on 8 April 2014 to authorize the Town Administrator to submit an application to the Office of the Inspector General to employ the Construction Manager at Risk (CMR) delivery method for the work of the project. Once submitted the approval process takes a number of weeks.

Topic: Criteria for Evaluating Options

T. Sitkoff stated that the methodology is “Jacobs Ladder”. The idea is to begin to develop in a very logical fashion the group criteria and priorities for assessing design options. . The results do not make the decision of which design to choose, but will provide information for discussion purposes.

J. Flewelling then advised all that the educational programming is considered the highest of all criteria and is therefore not part of the day’s exercise. All four options fully meet said program, which she summarized as follows:

- Design “grade level clusters” (K-2, 3-5, 6-8) to make a large school feel smaller.
- Grade level clusters adjacent to services such as SPED, ELL, etc.
- Design for shorter travel distances for younger students.

- Arrival/dismissal locations close to K-2 student areas, this also helps address building security concerns.
- Cafeteria and gym designed to be adjacent to outdoor play areas.
- Building shall include a Multi-Purpose Room that can house 40% of building population.

T. Sitkoff then presented the draft list of twenty (20) design variables that individuals will rank for the “Jacobs Ladder”. She explained that each item should be ranked by each person with a point value between 1 and 25. The more important an item is to an individual, the higher the point value they should assign to it. Once all parties have completed their rankings, the results will be tallied.

A discussion then took place for clarifications of the process and what each issue or aspect of the building design includes. It was noted by H. Charlupski that open space issues do not seem to be reflected in the list. T. Sitkoff stated that more criteria may be added later. P. Roberts noted that just because an issue may collectively rank lower than others it doesn’t mean that it is not important.

The “Draft List of Building Design Variables” is attached.

Topic: Jacob’s Ladder Ranking

The committee then began the exercise of individual ranking of criteria. Once that was done, T. Sitkoff polled each person as to their ranking for each of the criteria. The resultant tally is attached.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 9:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony Guigli  
Owner’s Project Manager